

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 94 04:30:09 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #615
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 3 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 615

Today's Topics:

440 in So. Cal.

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 3 Jun 1994 05:35:05 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-
for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2slncg\$qbl@lo-fan.jpl.nasa.gov>,
Randy Hammock <hammock@kelvin.jpl.nasa.gov> wrote:

>With the loss of the bottom 2.150mhz of the 220 band (remember the 150khz
>was given over to weak signal thus costing 6 more repeater channels to be
>lost), the 220SMA has instituted the policy of requiring all repeater
>owners to re-register their systems every three years. Systems that do
>not exist or do not submit the required paperwork will be decoordinated
>and purged from the files.

The Texas VHF-FM Society has a similar policy. They renew the coordinations
annually, and three months of inactivity is grounds for decoordination.

Texas had a big problem with "paper radios" with I was on the Board of the
Society. We adopted rules which allowed the coordinators to review and revoke
the coordinations under certain circumstances. It's worked pretty well, and

most of the "paper" has gone away.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans don't let the truth get in
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | the way of a good story."

Date: 3 Jun 1994 05:41:48 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!
sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCqq72H.6u4@netcom.com>, <1994Jun2.132403.14176@cs.brown.edu>,
<2sma1n\$mku@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>oSoft.
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2sma1n\$mku@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>,
Robb Topolski KJ6YT <topolski@kaiwan.com> wrote:

>It's not illegal to discriminate, unless that discrimination is based on
>some kind of protected class (race, religion, sex). If the coordinating
>body wanted to work toward some kind of balance, they could legally set
>up open/closed restrictions on who they approved as long as such a policy
>was otherwise fairly enforced.

Not illegal, maybe, but certainly unfair. A coordinating body that refused to
coordinate a frequency because the trustee wanted a closed repeater would
almost certainly be sued, or another competing organization would spring up
which would accomodate everyone.

As long as there is a demand for frequencies, this discussion will be held.
The thing which should be considered here is not whether the system is open
or closed. What should be considered is whether the frequency is being used.

A repeater with no users serves no one. If a radio has users, it should make
no difference to the coordinator whether the radio is open or closed. A
coordinator is just that... a _coordinator_. He cannot be asked to judge
who is "more worthy" of a frequency. Either the frequency is used or it's not.
His job is to minimize interference between coordinated systems.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans don't let the truth get in
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | the way of a good story."

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #615
